

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

<b>U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	<b>NO. 6:12cv235 LED-JDL</b>
	§	
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>RICOH AMERICAS CORPORATION</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

---

<b>U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	<b>NO. 6:12cv237 LED-JDL</b>
	§	
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>XEROX CORPORATION</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

---

<b>U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	<b>NO. 6:12cv329 LED-JDL</b>
	§	
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>KONICA MINOLTA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS U.S.A. INC.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

---

**U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,  
LLC,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**SHARP ELECTRONICS  
CORPORATION**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**NO. 6:12cv330 LED-JDL**

**PATENT CASE**

---

**U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,  
LLC,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**DIGI INTERNATIONAL INC., ET AL.**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**NO. 6:12cv351 LED-JDL**

**PATENT CASE**

---

**U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,  
LLC,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CIRRUS LOGIC, INC., ET AL.**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**NO. 6:12cv366 LED-JDL**

**PATENT CASE**

---

**U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,  
LLC,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**TRENDNET, INC.**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**NO. 6:12cv236 LED-JDL**

**PATENT CASE**

---

<b>U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,</b>	§	
<b>LLC,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	<b>NO. 6:12cv398 LED-JDL</b>
<b>v.</b>	§	
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,</b>	§	
<b>ET AL.</b>	§	
<b>Defendants.</b>	§	

---

<b>U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,</b>	§	
<b>LLC,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	<b>NO. 6:12cv399 LED-JDL</b>
<b>v.</b>	§	
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>NETGEAR, INC.</b>	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

---

<b>U.S. ETHERNET INNOVATIONS,</b>	§	
<b>LLC,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	<b>NO. 6:12cv481 LED-JDL</b>
<b>v.</b>	§	
	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
<b>STMICROELECTRONICS N.V., ET</b>	§	
<b>AL.</b>	§	
<b>Defendants.</b>		

**ORDER**

The Court finds that the administrative difficulties associated with serially filed cases wastes judicial resources by requiring common issues to be addressed individually for each case. *See Norman IP Holdings, LLC v. Lexmark Int’nl, Inc.*, No. 6:11cv495, 2012 WL 3307942, at \*4

(E.D. Tex. Aug. 10, 2012). Further, the Federal Circuit has recently noted that trial courts have “considerable discretion” to consolidate matters that share “a common question of law or fact.” *In re EMC Corp.*, 677 F.3d 1351, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (citing FED. R. CIV. P. 42). Because the above-styled cases involve a common question of law or fact, consolidation of the cases would promote efficient case management.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the above-styled cases shall be consolidated for pretrial issues only, with the exception of venue. The earliest filed civil action shall serve as the lead case for consolidated issues. The individual cases will remain active for venue motions and trial. Should the parties file motions to transfer or motions to sever and transfer, the Court will consider these motions only as to the defendants in the originally filed (member) cases, not as to all defendants in the pretrial consolidated case. *See Norman*, 2012 WL 3307942, at \*4. All motions, other than venue motions, shall be filed in the consolidated case. Further, the parties shall submit a single Docket Control, Discovery, ESI, and Protective Order, and each of the respective orders shall be filed in the lead case.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 24th day of September, 2012.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE